

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the August 14, 2007 telephone interview. The substance of the discussion held is incorporated into the amendments and remarks herein and is Applicants' record of the interview.

By way of this Amendment, Claims 1, 8, 12 and 18 are amended and Claims 4, 15 and 21-24 are canceled. Thus, the claims currently pending in this applications are Claims 1-3, 5-14 and 16-19. Claims 1, 8, 12 and 18 are the only independent claims.

Independent Claims 1, 8 and 18 define an indwelling stent, while independent Claim 12 defines a living organ dilator comprising an indwelling stent. Each of the independent claims defines that the stent comprises annular units arranged in an axial direction of the stent, with each annular unit comprising a plurality of annular elements arranged to surround the stent axis, and with adjacent portions of the annular elements in each annular unit being joined to each other through a joint.

In addition, independent Claims 1, 8 and 12 recite that adjacent annular units are interconnected at the joints by at least one link. As recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 12, the links have a primary axis substantially parallel to the stent axis, the joints in each of the annular units have a primary axis substantially parallel to the stent axis, and each link and the joints of the annular units to which the respective link is connected form a straight line.

Independent Claim 18 recites that at least one link is connected to one of the joints connecting adjacent annular elements in one annular unit and one of the joints connecting adjacent annular elements in an adjacent annular unit, and the at least one link has a primary axis substantially parallel to the stent axis. The joints in each of the annular units have a primary axis substantially parallel to the stent axis and the at least one link forms a straight line with the one joint connecting adjacent annular elements in the one annular unit and the one joint connecting adjacent annular elements in the adjacent annular unit.

As discussed in the present application, the joining of adjacent portions of annular elements through respective joints that have a primary axis substantially parallel to the stent axis, and the interconnection of adjacent annular units at the joints by the link(s) in the manner claimed provides a number of advantages. In one respect, the stent can be compressed to such an extent that the stent can be made relatively small in diameter. In addition, the links remain substantially unchanged upon expansion of the stent and so the overall length of the stent is not significantly changed upon expansion of the stent.

The Official Action sets forth a rejection of the independent claims based on the disclosure in U.S. Patent No. 6,896,695 to *Mueller et al.* in view of the disclosure in U.S. Patent no. 6,174,326 to *Kitaoka et al.* That rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Mueller et al. discloses a stent comprised of a plurality of axially arranged tubular portions 8. Each of the tubular portions 8 is comprised of a number of cell-shaped elements 10. The axially adjacent tubular portions 8 are connected to one another by way of first connecting bars 20 that extend between the cell-shaped

elements 10. In addition, the adjacent cell-shaped elements 10 forming each of the tubular portions 8 are connected to one another by way of S-shaped second connecting bars 14.

One way in which the stent recited in independents Claim 1, 8, 12 and 18 differs from the stent disclosed in *Mueller et al.* is that the claimed stent at issue involves the joints. As noted above, the claims recite that adjacent portions of the annular elements are joined to each other through a joint, and further recite that the joints in each annular unit have a primary axis substantially parallel to the stent axis. This is clearly not the case with the second connecting bars 14 disclosed in *Mueller et al.* Indeed, *Mueller et al.* specifically describes that the second connecting bars 14 are S-shaped as clearly illustrated in, for example, Fig. 1. At best, the S-shaped second connecting bars 14 might be said to be somewhat diagonally oriented relative to the stent axis, but clearly do not have a primary axis substantially parallel to the stent axis.

In addition, as recited in the independent claims at issue here, adjacent annular units are interconnected at the joints by at least one link. In *Mueller et al.*, the adjacent tubular portions 8 (annular units) are interconnected by the second connecting bars 20 which extend between the cell-shaped elements 10 in axially adjacent tubular portions 8. Thus, the adjacent tubular portions are not interconnected at the second connecting bars 14 (joints) by way of the first connecting bars 20 (links) as claimed.

By virtue of its construction, the stent disclosed in *Mueller et al.* suffers from the disadvantage that when the stent is expanded, the overall length of the stent is

changed due to the shortening of the cell-shaped elements 10 which are connected to one another by the second connecting bars 20.

Kitaoka et al. discloses a stent that includes several axially arranged annular units, each comprised of a plurality of annular elements. The annular elements in each annular unit are connected by connecting members that extend generally parallel to the circumferential extent of the stent (i.e., perpendicular to the stent axis). In addition, the axially adjacent annular units are connected by connectors extending between the connecting members.

Further, *Kitaoka et al.* specifically discloses that the connectors extending between axially adjacent annular elements are connected to connecting members that have a primary axis perpendicular to the stent axis. The links and joints form a "T" rather than a straight line as in the independent claims. Thus, *Kitaoka et al.* does not disclose or suggest adjacent portions of annular elements being joined to each other through respective joints that have a primary axis substantially parallel to the stent axis, with adjacent annular units being interconnected at such joints by at least one link so that the link and the respective joint form a straight line as recited in claims 1, 8, 12 and 18. Thus, the combination of the disclosures in *Mueller et al.* and *Kitaoka et al.* would not have resulted in a stent as claimed in which one or more joints have an axis parallel to the stent axis, one or more links have an axis parallel to the stent axis, and at least one link forms a straight line with the joint to which it is connected.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter recited in independent Claims 1, 8, 12 and 18 is patentably distinguishable over the a combination of the disclosures in *Mueller et al.* and *Kitaoka et al.*

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC

Date: August 20, 2007

By: 

Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 32,814
Michael Britton
Registration No. 47,260

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620